

### Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, and each was rejected. Each of the claims was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,298 (Boggs et al.). On November 26, 2004, Applicants filed a Terminal Disclaimer which was believed to overcome each of the claim rejections. The March 11, 2005, Office Action indicates that the Terminal Disclaimer was received and placed in the file; however, the Examiner stated that it did not comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) and/or (c) because it was signed by an attorney not of record.

Enclosed with this reply is a Statement under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b) establishing the right of assignee to take action; also enclosed is a Power of Attorney signed by a person authorized to act on behalf of the assignee. In addition, a new Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed with this reply, and is signed by an attorney authorized to act on behalf of the assignee by virtue of the enclosed Power of Attorney.

It is believed that the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer overcomes each of the claim rejections, and allowance of each of the pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**David Lee Boggs et al.**

By Marc F. Malooley  
Marc F. Malooley  
Reg. No. 50,624  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: April 28, 2005

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351